



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,199	11/21/2001	Walter Korber	608.0003USQ	1804

7590 12/11/2003

CHARLES N.J. RUGGIERO, ESQ.
OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, L.L.P.
ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10th FLOOR
STAMFORD, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

VU, HIEN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,199

Applicant(s)

KORBER, WALTER

Examiner

Hien D. Vu

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,6 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2833

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art figs. 3-4 in view of Kawai et al.

The claims are considered to be met by the prior art figs. 3-4 except that the prior art does not show a cover piece which arranges on the first side of the glass stopper for surrounding one pin and being connected with the metal sleeve. Kawai, figs. 1-4 and 9-10 show a cover piece 23 arranged on one side of a conductive shell 6 for surrounding one pin 9 and being connected with the conductive shell via a contact portion 24. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of the prior art by providing on the first side of the glass stopper with a cover piece with the features as described above, as taught by Kawai, in order to ground the pin connector. It is noted that the cover piece of Kawai would perform "sealed in" when it is positioned on the first side of the glass stopper since the recitation "sealed in" is vague and indefinite.

As to claim 8, the step of glazing of the glass stopper is old and well known in the art and therefore it would have been obvious to use such step on the glass stopper.

Art Unit: 2833

As to claim 9, the glass metal lead through being disposable in an ignition cap is old as described in the prior art of Figs. 3-4.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks on pages 6-7 stated that "the ground member of Kawai is detachable with respect to the housing and is clearly not sealed in the glass stopper". Such arguments are not persuasive because Kawai, Figs. 3-4 teach a cover piece to be arranged on one side of the conductive shell and surrounding one conductive pin for providing grounding for the conductive pin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to provide the cover piece to be surrounded one conductive pin on one side of the glass stopper for grounding the pin. Since the recitation "sealed in" is broad and vague, the cover piece of Kawai would perform as sealed in on the glass stopper section.

4. Claims 2, 4 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien Vu at telephone number (703) 308-2009.

Vu/ek

11/18/03

